Trans-Planckian dispersion and scale-invariance of inflationary perturbations

Jens C. Niemeyer*
Max-Planck-Institut für Astrophysik, Karl-Schwarzschild-Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany

Renaud Parentani†
Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Physique Théorique,
CNRS UMR 6083, Université de Tours, 37200 Tours, France

We investigate the insensitivity of the predictions of inflationary models with respect to modifications of Planck energy physics. The modification we consider consists in replacing the usual dispersion relation by nonlinear ones. This way of addressing the problem has recently recieved attention and contradictory results were found. Our main result is to show that the adiabaticity of the mode propagation and the separation of two scales of interest, the Planck scale and the cosmological horizon scale, are sufficient conditions for the predictions to be unchanged. We then show that almost all models satisfy the first condition if the second is met. Therefore the introduction of a nonlinear dispersion is unlikely to have any discernable effects on the power spectrum of cosmological perturbations.

PACS numbers: 98.70.Vc,98.80.Cq

arXiv:astro-ph/0101451v2 2 Feb 2001

A number of recent publications [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] address the so-called trans-Planckian problem of inflationary cosmology: in some inflationary scenarios, scales of cosmological interest today were redshifted from wavelengths far below the Planck length, $l_{\rm pl}$, at the onset of inflation. Since we do not have at present a consistent quantum theory at these scales, this appeal to unknown physics questions the validity of the standard predicitions of inflation, i.e. scale invariance of the power spectrum of cosmic fluctuations and Gaussianity of their distribution.

In usual scenarios, the metric fluctuations responsible for the generation of large scale structure and the temperature anisotropies of the cosmic microwave background radiation (CMBR) originate from quantum fluctuations of a massless field propagating in a background geometry whose expansion rate H is determined by the potential energy of the inflaton field [6, 7]. More specifically, the power spectrum of the metric fluctuations can be obtained from the vacuum expectation value of the two-point function of a minimaly coupled scalar field, evaluated at the time when the field wavelength is equal to the cosmological horizon H^{-1} [8]. If the potential is sufficiently flat, H is nearly constant in time, giving rise to a nearly scale invariant horizon crossing amplitude. Moreover, the linearity of the field equation results in the Gaussianity of the distribution statistics when the state of the field is vacuum.

To question the robustness of these results with respect to changes of Planck energy physics, Refs. [2, 3, 4] modified the propagation of the quantum field in this high frequency domain, in close analogy to what was done for Hawking radiation (see [1] for a review and references). The modification consists in replacing the linear dispersion relation which follows from Lorentz invariance by ad hoc nonlinear dispersion relations. The linearity of the field equation was maintained, guaranteeing that Gaussianity be preserved. Different forms of the dispersion relation were investigated, all of which reducing to the linear behavior for small frequencies but becoming nonlinear above a given wavenumber κ_c which can be thought to be of the order of the inverse Planck length. Assuming that horizon crossing occurs in the linear regime of the dispersion relation (i.e., that $H \ll \kappa_c$), Refs. [3, 4] find no violation of scale invariance of the fluctuation power spectrum. On the other hand, Ref. [2] claims to find significant scale non-invariance in some cases.

These opposite results raise three questions we shall address in this Letter: (1) What are the sufficient requirements for a nonlinear dispersion relation *not* to significantly violate the standard predictions of inflation? (2) How do the first deviations from the standard results manifest themselves in the power spectrum ? (3) Is the cosmological situation different from the black hole case [9, 10, 11, 12] where no deviation in the thermal spectrum was found when the cutoff frequency is much higher than the Hawking temperature, and if yes, why?

Given the spatial homogeneity of the background geometry, the propagation of a linear field is governed by the time evolution of the field modes χ_k with conserved comoving wavenumber k. Therefore the k-th component of the power spectrum is determined only by the amplitude of χ_k at the (conformal) time η_k of horizon crossing, i.e., when $k = a(\eta_k)\, H$, where $a(\eta)$ denotes the scale factor of the Friedmann-Robertson-Walker metric. When using the conventional dispersion relation, χ_k obeys the equation

$$\chi_k'' + \omega^2 \chi_k = 0 \ , \tag{1}$$

with ω^2 given by

$$\omega_0^2(\eta) = k^2 - \frac{a''(\eta)}{a(\eta)} \, , \tag{2}$$

where dashed variables stand for derivatives with respect to η (hence, $H = a'/a^2$). Upon modifying the dispersion relation, the wave equation is still given by Eq. (1) but ω_0^2 is replaced by

$$\omega_F^2(\eta) = [a(\eta)\, F(k/a(\eta))]^2 - \frac{a''(\eta)}{a(\eta)}\,. \qquad (3)$$

$F(k/a)$ is an as yet unspecified function which converges to the usual physical wavenumber $\kappa = k/a$ for $\kappa \ll \kappa_c$.

The phase and amplitude of χ_k are fixed by two conditions. First, its normalisation is provided by the Wronskian condition,

$$\chi_k\, {\chi'_k}^* - \chi_k^*\, \chi'_k = i\ , \qquad (4)$$

which follows from the requirement that the creation and annihilation operators satisfy the canonical commutation relations [13]. This condition equally applies for ω_0 and ω_F. Secondly, one needs a positive frequency condition. Then the mode so defined uniquely specifies the creation operator $a_k^\dagger$ that can be used to construct the k-component of the field state in Fock space.

The physical requirement fixing the state at η_i, i.e., at the onset of inflation, is that the k-components corresponding to physical wavenumbers $\kappa_i = k/a(\eta_i)$ that are very large, i.e., well above the temperature and H, should be in their ground state. When using the usual frequency ω_0 of Eq. (2), there is no problem in charcaterizing the vacuum since ω_0 is constant for early η_i. However, ω_F might still be time dependent at η_i. Hence one looses the conventional way of defining the vacuum. In order to define it, we shall follow the conventional adiabatic approach [13]. In an adiabatic regime, the adiabatic vacuum equivalently follows from the mathematical properties of the modes χ_k [14] or from the physical requirements to minimize either the probability for excitation of a comoving particle detector or the energy density of the field [2]. This is because both quantities are based on the local properties of χ_k that are accurately described by WKB waves.

It is well known that the adiabatic vacuum is associated with the positive frequency WKB solution of Eq. (1), normalized according to Eq. (4) and given by

$$\chi_k^{WKB}(\eta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\omega(\eta)}} \exp\left(-i\int_{\eta_i}^{\eta} \omega(\tilde\eta) d\tilde\eta\right)\ . \qquad (5)$$

The key point for us is that the probability for *non-adiabatic* transitions [14] (i.e., transitions leading to spontaneous excitation of the vacuum and interpreted in second quantization as pair creation) is determined by the corrections to Eq. (5). Indeed, in the adiabatic regime, i.e. when the adiabatic parameter

$$\mathcal{C}(\eta) \equiv \left|\frac{\omega'}{\omega^2}\right| \qquad (6)$$

satisfies $\mathcal{C}(\eta) \ll 1$ for all $\eta_i < \eta < \eta_f$, the pair creation probability amplitude at η_f is equal to backscattering amplitude β_k, i.e. the amplitude of the negative frequency part of χ_k evaluated at η_f, when starting at η_i with the positive frequency mode Eq. (5). Explicitely, β_k is defined by decomposing the exact solution χ_k at η_f as

$$\chi_k(\eta_f) = \alpha_k \chi_k^{WKB}(\eta_f) + \beta_k [\chi_k^{WKB}(\eta_f)]^*\,, \qquad (7)$$

where $|\alpha_k|^2 - |\beta_k|^2 = 1$.

In the context of inflation, if the evolution from η_f to the horizon crossing time η_k is governed by ω_0 (see below) β_k modifies the power spectrum $(\Delta\Phi)_k^2 \sim k^3 |\chi_k(\eta_k)|^2/a^2$. Using Eq. (7), we find

$$|\chi_k(\eta_k)|^2 = |\chi_k^{(0)}(\eta_k)|^2\ [1 + 2\Re e(\beta_k e^{i\phi_k}) + O(\beta^2)] \qquad (8)$$

where $\chi_k^{(0)}$ is the unperturbed amplitude evaluated using ω_0 when working in the unperturbed vacuum ($\beta_k = 0$). $e^{i\phi_k}$ is a pure phase which depends on the value of η_f. Hence β_k determines the amplitude of the modulation around the usual horizon crossing amplitude.

The condition for Eq. (8) to be valid is that the horizon and cutoff scales be well separated:

$$\sigma \equiv \frac{\kappa_c}{H} \approx \frac{m_{\rm pl}}{H} \gg 1\ . \qquad (9)$$

In this case, η_f can be chosen such that the physical wavenumber $\kappa = k/a$ is, at the same time, much smaller than κ_c and much bigger than H. In this intermediate regime, the second term in Eqs. (2) and (3) is small compared to the first for $\eta < \eta_f$ and can therefore be neglected in the evaluation of $\mathcal{C}$. Furthermore, F is assumed to be in the linear regime at η_f, thus $F(k/a(\eta > \eta_f)) = k/a$. The evolution of χ_k from η_f to η_k is therefore identical to the standard, non-dispersive case. Consequently, to obtain identical horizon crossing amplitude, it suffices to show that the modified mode governed by ω_F coincides at η_f with the purely positive frequency mode obtained when using ω_0. This requires only $\beta_k \ll 1$.

In the case where, in addition to $\mathcal{C} \ll 1$, $\mathcal{C} \to 0$ for both $\eta \to \eta_i$ and $\eta \to \eta_f$, β_k is exponentially small [14]. In our specific case governed by ω_F this exponential would be of the type $e^{-\kappa_c/H}$, i.e. completely negligible if Eq. (9) is satisfied. However, the condition $\mathcal{C} \to 0$ for $\eta \to \eta_f$ is unlikely to be met since one has to evaluate β_k at a given finite time, in particular before the last term of Eq. (3) becomes significant. When evaluating β_k with $\mathcal{C}(\eta_f) \neq 0$, only weaker predictions can be made. Nevertheless, when $\mathcal{C} \ll 1$ and slowly varying from η_i till η_f, β_k is bounded by the maximum of $\mathcal{C}(\eta)$. (This can be obtained from the boundary contributions at η_f generated by multiple integrations by parts, see Sect. 2.4 in [14].) Hence β_k is still negligible when $\mathcal{C}(\eta) \ll 1$.

In brief, the robustness of the preditions of inflationary models follows from (a) the linear relationship between the modulations of the horizon crossing amplitude and the backscattering amplitude and (b) from the smallness of this amplitude when both adiabaticity, $\mathcal{C} \ll 1$, and scale separation, $\sigma \gg 1$, are met.

This is in complete agreement with what has been found in black hole physics. In that case, due to the stationarity of the metric, one works with fixed frequency ω rather than fixed wavenumber k and the differential analysis proceeds with the radial variable r rather than with the time η. When the appropriate adiabatic condition is met, see Eq. (47) in [10], and when the cutoff scale is well separated from the Hawking temperature, which is fixed by the inverse radius of the hole and which plays the role of H, positive norm WKB waves provide good approximations of the modified modes, in the sense that the amplitude of negative norm component of these modes is negligible. This guarantees that the modifications of the Hawking flux will be equally negligible. In fact, the first order modulations of the flux have been shown to scale like σ^{-2} [12]. Thus, as in cosmology, scale separation and adiabaticity of the mode propagation protect the predictions from alterations generated by a nonlinear dispersion relation.

Let us now show that in most cases, scale separation Eq. (9) leads to adiabaticity through the relation $\mathcal{C} \simeq \sigma^{-1} \ll 1$. To this end, we write Eq. (6) as

$$\mathcal{C} \approx \left| \frac{H}{F} - \frac{H\kappa}{F^2} \frac{d\,F}{d\,\kappa} \right| \leq \left| \frac{H}{F} \right| + \left| \frac{H\kappa}{F^2} \frac{d\,F}{d\,\kappa} \right| \qquad (10)$$

with $\kappa = k/a$. Obviously, the dispersion relation used by Unruh [9] which behaves as $F(\kappa) \to \kappa_c$ for $\kappa \to \infty$ is globally adiabatic as the first term is $\sim \sigma^{-1} \ll 1$ and the second term vanishes. This is in agreement with the results of Refs. [2, 3].

We consider next the class of functions $F(\kappa)$ which grow monotonically with κ. Here, the first term in Eq. (10) can be neglected as it is smaller than the corresponding term obtained using the linear dispersion relation and which is already negligible. The second term also vanishes asymptotically for $F \sim \kappa^n$ with any positive n, as well as for exponentially and logarithmically growing functions. This class includes the dispersion relation of Ref. [4] in agreement with the author's conclusion. On the other hand, it also includes the superluminal dispersion relation investigated in Ref. [2] where it is claimed that it gives rise to deviations from the standard result. Our result is obviously in conflict with that of Ref. [2].

Finally, the dispersion relation may become singular at a finite wavenumber $\kappa_\infty \simeq \kappa_c$,

$$F(\kappa) = \frac{\kappa}{(1-\kappa/\kappa_\infty)^n} \ . \qquad (11)$$

For $n = 1$, the second term in Eq. (10) becomes equal to the first at $\kappa = \kappa_\infty$, whereas it vanishes for $n > 1$ and diverges for $n < 1$. Only in the latter case, the notion of an adiabatic vacuum becomes invalid near the cutoff scale, making the predictions for inflationary fluctuations dependent on an alternative choice of initial conditions, or a later specification of the initial state, see below.

The situation is different if F decreases monotonically for $\kappa > \kappa_0 \simeq \kappa_c$, as the first term in Eq. (10) grows without bound and $\mathcal{C} \neq 0$ for nonlinear F. Even for strictly positive F, i.e. disregarding the additional complications due to complex dispersion relations, there exists a time η where F is smaller than H. According to Eq. (10), this causes the breakdown of the adiabatic condition because cosmological expansion begins to dominate the dynamics. In other words, those modes with wavenumber $\gg H^{-1}$ are "frozen" in the beginning [1]. As they are streched by cosmic expansion, their proper frequency grows according to the nonlinear behavior of the dispersion relation. Therefore, because of Eq. (9), the adiabaticity condition will be satisfied before the dispersion relation reaches the linear branch. As an example, consider the subluminal dispersion relation of Corley & Jacobson [11] (also analyzed in Ref. [2]):

$$F(\kappa) = \kappa \sqrt{1 - \left(\frac{\kappa}{\kappa_0}\right)^{2n}} \ . \qquad (12)$$

At $\kappa = \kappa_0/2$, the corresponding adiabaticity parameter is $\mathcal{C} \simeq \sigma^{-1} \ll 1$ for $n = O(1)$.

If an early non-adiabatic phase is followed by an intermediate adiabatic regime on Planckian but sub-horizon scales, any viable initial solution cannot deviate too far from the adiabatic vacuum without violating the consistency of the inflationary framework. In the intermediate adiabatic regime, the number of these primordial particles is constant and the usual rules for computing the energy density apply. Therefore their energy density will be of the order of $\kappa_0^4 n(k)$ where $n(k) = |\beta_k|^2$ is their occupation number density. Without some fine tuning of $n(k)$, this term may become comparable to or even larger than the inflaton potential energy, invalidating the key condition for inflation to take place. This point was recently (and independently) developed by Tanaka [16][2]. On the other hand, if the contribution of $n(k)$ to the expansion rate is negligible compared to that of the inflaton potential, one has $n(k) \ll \sigma^{-2} \ll 1$ for $k/a \simeq \kappa_c$, i.e., these modes must be extremely close to the adiabatic vacuum. Thus the predictions of inflation remain

[1] This phenomenon was also investigated in Ref. [15] which appeared shortly before this article was finished.

[2] For an early discussion of this point in the black hole context we refer to [17]. In this case, for exactly the same reasons, the hypothesis of having a regular metric near the horizon severly constrains the occupation number $n(\omega)$ if an intermediate adiabatic regime exists.

unchanged. These remarks apply, for instance, to the case $n < 1$ in Eq. (11) if $\kappa_\infty/H \ll 1$ and to subluminal dispersion relations with $F \leq H$.

To summarize, we found that all regular, monotonically growing dispersion relations are globally adiabatic and thus unlikely to give rise to non-standard perturbation spectra if horizon crossing occurs in the linear dispersion regime. Only those functions that decrease with increasing wavenumber, or that contain a certain type of singularity, violate adiabaticity at early times. In those cases, the specification of the initial state is conceptually less clear than in the former where the adiabatic vacuum is available. However, if adiabaticity is restored well before horizon crossing, the initial conditions can be assigned in this intermediate regime, guaranteeing that the adiabatic solution holds after this point. Again, the standard inflationary predictions remain unchanged.

One can also question the validity of the assumption of scale separation itself, and speculate about potential signatures if the field is still in the (slightly) nonlinear dipersion regime at horizon crossing. Given that in the simplest scenarios for inflation, the CMBR fluctuation amplitude scales inversely with σ evaluated at horizon crossing of the respective wavelength [6], we know that $\sigma \approx 10^5$. Whether or not this number should be considered "large" cannot be answered without independent experimental constraints on residual Planck scale effects on long wavelength phenomena. Indeed, Amelino-Camelia & Piran [18] invoke nonlinear corrections to the dispersion relation as a possible explanation for the observation of ultra-high energy cosmic rays and TeV-photons whose fluxes would normally be suppressed by interactions with CMBR and infrared background photons, respectively. Intriguingly, their allowed region of parameter space is consistent with a second order correction whose coefficient corresponds to $\sigma \approx 10^5$. Nonlinear dispersion acting on length scales comparable to the horizon length during inflation therefore cannot be ruled out on experimental grounds alone. By noting that the amplitude of the WKB solution Eq. (5) depends only on the local value of F rather than its history, one can estimate the ratio of the horizon crossing amplitude in the standard and dispersive theories as $\sim H/F(H)$ [3] (assuming strict adiabaticity of the prior evolution). Like in the standard theory, time translation symmetry of de Sitter space has to be broken by making H a weakly time dependent variable in order to obtain a scale dependent perturbation spectrum. Depending on $g = \Delta F(\kappa)/\Delta\kappa$, with $\Delta k = \Delta\kappa\, a$ covering the cosmological scales observable today, we speculate that the natural reddening of the spectrum due to the slow decline of H will be slightly enhanced ($g > 1$), reduced ($0 \leq g < 1$), or even reversed ($g < 0$) as the fluctuation amplitude changes more or less rapidly, or in the opposite direction, as a function of proper wavelength than in the standard theory.

In conclusion, nonlinear dispersion alone is unlikely to have any clearly discernable effects on the power spectrum of cosmological perturbations. As suggested in Ref. [3] and argued on the basis of noncommmutative geometry in Ref. [19], a more promising signature of Planck scale physics may be non-Gaussianity of the fluctuation statistics.

J.C.N. would like to thank Achim Kempf for valuable discussions, and acknowledges the support and hospitality of the DARC at Meudon and of the University of Tours where this work was initiated in Dec. 2000. R.P. is grateful to Amaury Mouchet for instructive discussions concerning adiabaticity.

* jcn@mpa-garching.mpg.de
† parenta@celfi.phys.univ-tours.fr

[1] T. Jacobson, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **136**, 1 (2000), hep-th/0001085.
[2] J. Martin and R. H. Brandenberger (2000), hep-th/0005209.
[3] J. C. Niemeyer (2000), astro-ph/0005533.
[4] J. Kowalski-Glikman (2000), astro-ph/0006250.
[5] A. Kempf (2000), astro-ph/0009209.
[6] A. D. Linde, Rept. Prog. Phys. **47**, 925 (1984).
[7] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, *The Early Universe* (Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, USA, 1990).
[8] V. F. Mukhanov, Sov. Phys. JETP **67**, 1297 (1988).
[9] W. G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 2827 (1995).
[10] R. Brout, S. Massar, R. Parentani, and P. Spindel, Phys. Rev. **D52**, 4559 (1995), hep-th/9506121.
[11] S. Corley and T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 1568 (1996), hep-th/9601073.
[12] H. Saida and M. Sakagami, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 084023 (2000), gr-qc/9905034.
[13] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Univ. Pr., Cambridge, UK, 1984).
[14] S. Massar and R. Parentani, Nucl. Phys. **B513**, 375 (1998), gr-qc/9706008.
[15] L. Mersini, M. Bastero-Gil, and P. Kanti (2001), hep-ph/0101210.
[16] T. Tanaka (2000), astro-ph/0012431.
[17] T. Jacobson, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 1731 (1991).
[18] G. Amelino-Camelia and T. Piran (2000), astro-ph/0008107.
[19] C.-S. Chu, B. R. Greene, and G. Shiu (2000), hep-th/0011241.